

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 043

CG 009 857

AUTHOR Letchworth, George A.; Stansell, Vance
 TITLE Influence of Situational Factors and Teacher Characteristics on Drug-Related Disciplinary Decisions.
 PUB DATE Mar 75
 NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975); Best Copy Available
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
 DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; *Decision Making; *Discipline; *Dogmatism; Drinking; Research Projects; Speeches; *Teacher Characteristics
 IDENTIFIERS *Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the influence of teacher characteristics (age, gender, and dogmatism) and situational factors (self-motivated, other-motivated and in-class, out-of-class behavior) upon the judgments that are made regarding discipline decisions and perceived causal factors of alcohol related problem behaviors. Eighty educators read scenarios describing four problem behaviors involving alcohol and were instructed to respond in three ways. The educators also completed the short form of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The causal attributions of the educators were analyzed separately for each of the four drug problems. From the comparison of scores, it was apparent that the "age" main effect was a strong one. Younger educators consistently recommended less severe discipline techniques than did the older group. The low dogmatism educators recommended the most severe disciplines while the high dogmatic educators recommended the least severe discipline. (Author/PC)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Influence of Situational
Factors and Teacher Characteristics
on Drug-related Disciplinary Decisions

George A. Letchworth
and
Vance Stansell

University of Oklahoma

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, March 1975
Washington, D.C.

ED108043

CG009857

The Influence of Situational Factors and Teacher Characteristics on Drug-related Disciplinary Decisions

The investigation of the judgmental processes underlying the perception of individuals, generally called person perception, has been extensive (Taguiri, 1969). The model often employed in these studies identifies three major components: the judge, the situation, and the person being judged. The application of the person perception findings and this model to applied situations such as the judgmental process underlying disciplinary decisions in educational settings has been limited. Investigations in this area have primarily dealt with the teachers' influences upon student behavior and the attitudes and behaviors of students receiving discipline (Woodruff, 1958). The variables which affect educator's judgments and perceptions when dealing with problem behavior have not received much attention (Letchworth and Stansell, 1974) especially in drug related problem behaviors.

Various studies have shown that person perceptions are affected by the authoritarian or dogmatic traits of the perceiver (Secord and Backman, 1964). Rokeach (1959) describes dogmatism as the relative degree of open or closed-mindedness, basically determined by the extent to which a person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information on its own merits. Dogmatism has been investigated with respect to teacher effectiveness (Soderbergh, 1969; Charters, 1969; and Eulau, 1965) and with respect to its influence upon discipline decisions made by teachers (Letchworth and Stansell, 1974). A number of studies have shown that person perceptions vary systematically with the age and sex of the perceiver. Gender of

the judge has been found salient in several studies investigating person perception (Shrauger and Altrochi, 1964; Cline, 1964) and in investigations of teachers' discipline decisions (Letchworth and Stansell, 1974). The teacher characteristic, age, has been shown to affect decisions concerning discipline in drug offenses at a junior college (Dotson, 1973).

Not only are teacher characteristics important in the judgmental process but the judgment of an individual's behavior is also influenced by the context in which it occurs (Secord and Backman, 1964). Judgments of behaviors of an individual are often quite different depending upon the interpretation of the cause as being either internal or external in nature; that is, the perceived motives of the actor (Secord and Backman, 1964). The present study investigates the influence of teacher characteristics (age, gender, and dogmatism) and situational factors (self-motivated, other-motivated and in-class, out-of-class behavior) upon the judgments that are made regarding discipline decisions and perceived causal factors of alcohol related problem behaviors.

METHOD

Eighty subjects were selected from a group of 140 graduate students in education who were experienced teachers, counselors, and administrators. The educators read scenarios describing four problem behaviors involving alcohol that varied as to self or other motivated and occurred in or out of class. The educators were then instructed to respond in three ways. They first responded to an open-ended request to "List in your own words what disciplinary

action you would recommend." They were then instructed to choose from a set of eighteen disciplinary techniques the one they would recommend. The techniques had been chosen from a list of thirty-seven obtained from a survey of techniques used in public schools (Porter, 1972) and then scaled using the Thurstone technique (Edwards, 1957) on a dimension of severity from one--being most severe--to eleven--being least severe. The third response was: "In the problem situation what do you see as the cause or causes of the student's behavior. Please feel free to speculate as to the possible cause or causes."

The educators also completed Trolldahl's (1965) short form of Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale. High scores indicating close mindedness and low scores indicating open mindedness. The possible range is 20-140.

The educators were classified according to their gender, age, and dogmatism. The dogmatism classification was accomplished by a median split with scores sixty and below being classified as low dogmatism and those sixty-one or above being classified as high in dogmatism. The subject scores on the severity of discipline were cast into a 2 (teacher dogmatism) X 2 (teacher age) X 2 (teacher gender) X 2 (self, other motivated) X 2 (in, out of class behavior) design and an analysis of variance with repeated measures on the last two factors was performed.

The causal attribution of the educators were analyzed separately for each of the four drug problems by means of the coding system devised by Elig and Friege (1974).

Elig and Friege (1974) in devising the coding system for perceived causability present three sources to which caused attribution may be assigned: internal, external, and mutual. An internal attribution according to them is one that states that the person is the source of the cause; where as the external attribution states that the source of the cause is external to the person; such as, in other people, in luck, in pressures from peer groups and in social norms, etc.. Mutual sources are often grouped with external sources since "the person's perspective mutual sources depend on the presence of external objects or other people."

The coding system also provides for stable attributes relatively fixed and unchanging from situation to situation, and unstable attributes which are situational and variable. The causal attributions of the educators (the third open ended response) were categorized into a 2 (stable-unstable) by 2 (internal-self or external-other) matrix and a Chi Square was performed on each of the four scenarios.

RESULTS

The results of the analysis of variance are shown in the summary table in the Appendix. In addition, another analysis of variance was performed with only the six extreme dogmatism scores (high and low) in each category. This was done in order to get a group that was more representative of low and high dogmatism than was obtained by splitting dogmatism scores at the median. A comparison of the significant findings of each analysis is shown in the table in the appendix.

The Chi Square analysis of the causal attributions indicated only one scenario (self-out of class behavior) as being significantly differentially attributed.

DISCUSSION

From the comparison of the two analyses of variance it is apparent that the B (age) main effect is a strong one. Although not as interpretable as it should be because of interaction effects, the age (B) main effect does indicate that the younger (30 and under) educators did consistently recommend less severe discipline techniques than did the older group.

The AE (dogmatism by in or out of class situation) interaction also was consistent across the two analyses ($p < .10$ for $N=10$ and $p < .05$ for $N=6$). The low dogmatism educator, reading an in-class situation consistently recommended most severe disciplines while the high dogmatic educator reading a scenario involving in-class situations consistently recommend the least severe discipline.

Since there were several interaction effects significant in each of the analyses, it appears that the three educator characteristics of dogmatism, age, and gender operated differentially with perceived motivation and situational factors in producing discipline decision, concerning alcohol related problem behaviors.

REFERENCES

- Charters, W. W. The Commonwealth Teacher Training Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929. Cited by Johnson, James S., "Change in Student Teacher Dogmatism," Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 62, 224-226.
- Cline, V. B. Interpersonal perception. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in Experimental Personality Research. New York: Academic Press, 1974.
- Dotson, H. K. Is there a difference between over and under twenty-five year old males and females that administer discipline in a student court when the dependent is charged with selling marijuana? Unpublished study, University of Oklahoma, 1973.
- Edwards, A. L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
- Emlaw, Rita. Teacher effectiveness: a method for prediction and evaluation. The National Elementary Principal, 1963, 43, 38-49.
- Letchworth, G. A. and Stansell, V. The influence of teacher characteristics and type of behavior problem on severity of discipline decisions. Paper presented at Oklahoma Psychological Association Convention, November, 1974.
- Porter, E. W. The effect of the type of offense committed, appearance, and previous behavior on discipline decisions rendered by public school disciplinarians. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1972.
- Secord, P. F. and Backman, C. W. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Shrauger, S. and Altrocchi, J. The personality of the perceiver as a factor in person perception. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 289-308.
- Soderbergh, P. A. Dogmatism and the public school teacher. Journal of Teacher Education, 1964, 15, 245-251.
- Tagiuri, R. Person Perception. In Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Troldahl, V. C. and Powell, F. A. A short form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. Social Forces, 1965, 44, 211-214.

Woodruff, A. D. Discipline. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd Ed., 1959, 381-385.

SCENARIOS

1. SELF-MOTIVATED, IN-CLASS: A student falls asleep during class obviously intoxicated. Upon questioning, the student says "school is a real drag and drinking helps."
2. OTHER-MOTIVATED, IN-CLASS: A student comes into class intoxicated. Upon questioning, the student says "I am new to the school and in order to become one of the group I agreed to drink with the group during the lunch break."
3. OTHER-MOTIVATED, OUT-OF-CLASS: A student (along with several others) is found to be intoxicated at a football game. The student states that "I was only getting into the school spirit and besides all the students always drink before the games."
4. SELF-MOTIVATED, OUT-OF-CLASS: At a school dance a student who came to the dance (alone) is found to have been drinking. The student states that "such school activities are uptight and a person has to have a drink in order to make it through them."

CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

	30 AND UNDER		31 AND OVER			
	Male	Female	Male	Female		
Low Dogmatism	$\bar{X} = 4.83$ S.D.=3.25	$\bar{X} = 7.00$ S.D.=1.55	$\bar{X} = 4.33$ S.D.=1.97	$\bar{X} = 5.17$ S.D.=2.71	In-class	Self-Motivated
	$\bar{X} = 7.00$ S.D.=2.53	$\bar{X} = 8.33$ S.D.=1.97	$\bar{X} = 4.33$ S.D.=1.97	$\bar{X} = 5.83$ S.D.=3.13	Out-of-class	
	$\bar{X} = 7.83$ S.D.=2.14	$\bar{X} = 5.50$ S.D.=2.35	$\bar{X} = 3.67$ S.D.=1.97	$\bar{X} = 6.00$ S.D.=3.29	In-class	Other-Motivated
	$\bar{X} = 6.67$ S.D.=1.97	$\bar{X} = 8.50$ S.D.=1.64	$\bar{X} = 5.50$ S.D.=3.33	$\bar{X} = 5.67$ S.D.=3.14	Out-of-class	
High Dogmatism	$\bar{X} = 7.00$ S.D.=1.55	$\bar{X} = 7.50$ S.D.=1.64	$\bar{X} = 5.83$ S.D.=2.23	$\bar{X} = 6.50$ S.D.=1.22	In-class	Self-Motivated
	$\bar{X} = 7.17$ S.D.=1.94	$\bar{X} = 7.50$ S.D.=2.59	$\bar{X} = 7.50$ S.D.=2.07	$\bar{X} = 4.17$ S.D.=2.86	Out-of-class	
	$\bar{X} = 8.50$ S.D.=1.22	$\bar{X} = 8.67$ S.D.=1.63	$\bar{X} = 7.33$ S.D.=1.51	$\bar{X} = 5.83$ S.D.=3.54	In-class	Other-Motivated
	$\bar{X} = 7.17$ S.D.=2.79	$\bar{X} = 8.17$ S.D.=2.32	$\bar{X} = 6.17$ S.D.=3.19	$\bar{X} = 5.33$ S.D.=3.20	Out-of-class	

SIGNIFICANT RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FOR N = 10 AND N = 6

	10 Subjects	6 Subjects	Common to both
MAIN EFFECTS:			
A (Dogmatism)		$p < .10$	
B (Age)	$p < .01$	$p < .01$	*
C (Gender)			
D (Self-other motivated)	$p < .05$		
E (in-out of class)			
INTERACTION EFFECTS:			
AE	$p < .10$	$p < .05$	*
DE	$p < .05$		
BCE		$p < .10$	
ABCDE		$p < .05$	

MEAN SEVERITY SCORES FOR
N=10 AND N=6

B Main:	30 and under	31 and over
N=10	7.413	5.738
N=6	7.333	5.573

AE Interaction:	in-class	out-of-class	
N=10	5.963	6.688	low dogmatism
	6.888	6.763	high dogmatism
N=6	5.542	6.479	low dogmatism
	7.146	6.646	high dogmatism

SOURCE	1,5.	512.	1,5030	0.2801
TOTAL	7.137	79.		
BETWEEN	17.104	79.		
A	10.778	1.	1.5030	0.2801
B	221.109	1.	14.0340	0.0005
C	0.200	1.	0.0131	0.9054
AB	0.205	1.	0.0134	0.9042
AC	0.200	1.	0.0131	0.9054
BC	0.051	1.	0.0033	0.0828
ABC	1.402	1.	0.1175	0.7320
WEK	15.337	72.		

WITHIN	5.805	240.		
D	15.313	1.	4.1778	0.0420
AD	2.114	1.	0.5768	0.5436
BD	0.117	1.	0.0047	0.9141
CD	5.510	1.	1.5034	0.2219
ABD	0.005	1.	0.1052	0.0434
ACD	0.115	1.	0.0313	0.7543
BCD	7.010	1.	2.1309	0.1130
ABCD	0.021	1.	1.0064	0.1709
WEK	5.085	72.		
E	7.200	1.	1.6343	0.1706
AE	10.451	1.	3.6817	0.0558
BE	0.452	1.	0.1151	0.7350
CE	1.205	1.	0.3172	0.5819
ABE	4.048	1.	1.0313	0.3142
ACE	7.202	1.	1.8350	0.1765
BCE	0.005	1.	0.0012	0.9707
ABCE	0.798	1.	0.2027	0.6584
WEK	5.925	72.		
DE	13.011	1.	3.9803	0.0470
ADE	0.706	1.	0.1778	0.6780
BDE	7.312	1.	2.2847	0.1312
CDE	4.021	1.	0.2984	0.5932
ABDE	0.020	1.	0.0057	0.9360
ACDE	0.024	1.	0.0071	0.9306
BCDE	2.104	1.	0.0154	0.5587
ABCDE	3.594	1.	1.0511	0.3095
WEK	3.420	72.		

★ EDSTAT JOB FINISHED ★

		D.F.	F-RATIO	P
TOTAL	6,762	191.		
BETWEEN	14,433	47.		
A	37,630	1.	3.3822	0.0700
B	148,757	1.	13.3701	0.0010
C	4,380	1.	0.3937	0.5408
AB	0,877	1.	0.0789	0.7769
AC	22,003	1.	1.9777	0.1640
BC	5,004	1.	0.4497	0.5132
ABC	14,634	1.	1.3153	0.2572
XE<	11,126	40.		
WITHIN	4,259	144.		
D	7,922	1.	1.8473	0.1786
AD	0,422	1.	0.0984	0.7536
BD	1,506	1.	0.3511	0.5636
CD	1,879	1.	0.4382	0.5187
ABD	1,173	1.	0.2736	0.6099
ACD	3,798	1.	0.8857	0.6453
BCD	3,250	1.	0.7580	0.6067
ABCD	3,261	1.	0.7603	0.6075
XE<	4,288	40.		
E	2,297	1.	0.5964	0.5494
AE	24,795	1.	6.4388	0.0145
BE	2,755	1.	0.7155	0.5927
CE	0,129	1.	0.0335	0.8499
ABE	1,176	1.	0.3054	0.5901
ACE	3,803	1.	0.9875	0.6727
BCE	14,632	1.	3.7996	0.0553
ABCE	0,123	1.	0.0319	0.8533
XE<	3,851	40.		
DE	2,752	1.	0.6611	0.5736
ADE	0,883	1.	0.2121	0.6522
BDE	2,297	1.	0.5517	0.5315
CDE	11,509	1.	2.7643	0.1005
ABDE	0,419	1.	0.1006	0.7510
ACDE	2,295	1.	0.5513	0.5313
BCDE	3,258	1.	0.7824	0.6145
ABCDE	24,790	1.	5.9539	0.0182
XE<	4,164	40.		

★ EDSTAT JOB FINISHED ★

Burroughs
ECOM-STAT